

OBSERVATIONS ON THE MANUSCRIPT TRADITION OF BYZANTINE MUSIC.

II. THE CONTENTS OF SOME EARLY HEIRMOLOGIA.

Jørgen Raasted.

At the Congresso Internazionale di Musica Bizantina e Orientale Liturgica, Grottaferrata 1968, I gave a first report on my studies on the contents of the archaic and classical Heirmologia. This was followed up in 1969 by a short article which was published in the first fascicle of the CAHIERS; I introduced here a simple set of call-numbers to provide easy and exact references to all Heirmoi¹.

The Atti of the Grottaferrata Congress have not yet been published. I have therefore asked their editor, the Reverend Father Bartolomeo Di Salvo of Grottaferrata, for his permission to make a preliminary edition of my report in our CAHIERS; for as long as this has not been published, I cannot very well continue the planned series of articles on the subject. The text of my report follows below, basically in its original shape; only a few outdated remarks have been changed.

I

In 1968-70 the Monumenta Musicae Byzantinae published a facsimile edition of a musical manuscript from Jerusalem, the Heirmologion Saba 83 from the early 12th century². This manuscript is the latest of five Heirmologia in which the melodies are written in one of the archaic musical notations. Like the other archaic Heirmologia it contains hundreds of Heirmoi that

1. Observations...I. A list of Heirmos call-numbers, based on Eustratiades's edition of the Heirmologion (Cahiers 1, 1969, pp.1-12).

2. Monumenta Musicae Byzantinae VIII: Hirmologium Sabbaiticum, edendum curavit Jørgen Raasted (VIII.1 Pars supplatoria: Prolegomena & indices, 1968; VIII.2.1 Pars prima: Toni authentici, 1968; VIII.2.2 Pars secunda: Toni plagales, 1970).

are not included in the 'normal' repertory as preserved in MSS from the 12th and 13th centuries. To be more precise: The Saba Heirmologion is secondary in richness only to one other MS, the Lavra Heirmologion B 32. There is no need to say more about the general value of Saba 83; it is evidently a capital source for those who take an interest in the early history of the Heirmologion.

Among the questions which I try to answer in the introduction of the facsimile edition, one concerns the order of its contents. In itself this is not a very interesting kind of problem; but in the particular case of Saba 83 the answers seem to have a wider bearing on the structure of other Heirmologia as well. A comparison with the contents of some other early sources may even give at least an idea of a kind of 'Ur-Heirmologion'.

In writing their Kanons the Byzantine poets frequently - and freely - borrowed the melodies from other Kanons, i. e. they used preexisting Heirmoi. Therefore the number of Heirmoi or model stanzas for Byzantine Kanon poetry is small if compared to the vast repertory of Kanons. We know the medieval melodies of these model stanzas from the Heirmologia, special collections in which the Heirmoi are arranged in 8 sections, corresponding to the eight church modes. Within each modal section most Greek Heirmologia group their Heirmoi in sequences of eight or nine pieces, corresponding to the eight or nine Odes of a Kanon.

In the Slavonic Heirmologia the Heirmoi are not arranged in 'Kanon Order' but in 'Ode Order' where all Heirmoi for each Ode are kept together. The OdO arrangement is also used in some Greek Heirmologia, especially in late copies.

A sequence of Heirmoi in KaO is called an Akolouthia. As a rule each Akolouthia is provided with a heading which contains the name of a poet and which may also assign the Akolouthia to a particular feast. In some Heirmologia, especially the oldest ones, the Akolouthiai of each modal section are furthermore provided with ordinal numbers.

In his report to the Oxford Congress in 1966 Oliver Strunk pointed out that the names given in these headings "need not

mean that the poet in question is also the author of the texts of the hirmoi and the composer of the melodies to which they are sung"; for all we know, the name may as well refer to the poet who has put together a new mixture of previously known Heirmoi, to be used as metrical and musical basis for a new Kanon³. The ascription would thus cover the Akolouthia, the set or sequence of Heirmoi, and would say nothing about the authorship of the Heirmoi themselves. It is my impression that these radical conclusions were not shared by Professor Schirò who read a supplementary report at the Oxford Congress⁴, at least not in their totality. But even though the views of these two distinguished scholars may be said to differ in this respect, they agree on others that are equally fundamental. For my present purpose two of their observations are especially important. One is that the development of the Heirmologion cannot be isolated from the development of the Kanon or from that of the office-books; in Strunk's words the development of the Heirmologion "is simply a reflection or even a distant echo of developments that are the proper concern of Byzantine hymnography". The other important point is best formulated in Professor Schirò's demand that the wanderings of each Heirmos should be followed separately, in the Heirmologia as well as in the office-books.

Now the idea of studying the 'iter degli heirmoi' immediately meets one serious obstacle. The total number of preserved Heirmoi is very great; it is likely to exceed 3000. Furthermore, the conventional style of this kind of poetry involves that hundreds of them begin in almost the same way. We need some kind of easy and exact reference to each Heirmos, if we

3. Oliver Strunk, Byzantine music in the light of recent research and publication (Proceedings of the XIIIth International Congress of Byzantine Studies, Oxford 1966, London 1967), p.250.

4. Giuseppe Schirò, Problemi heirmologici, ibidem pp. 255-66.

are to speak of them without being forced to identify them each time by long incipits. Following a suggestion of Oliver Strunk's, I have therefore provided a copy of Eustratiades's Heirmologion with consecutive numbers for all its Heirmoi from one end of the book to the other. A list of these call-numbers has now been published (cf. above, note 1), covering some 95 percent of all known Heirmoi. The relatively few Heirmoi which are not found in Eustratiades raise some problems. One solution would be to print the texts of such Heirmoi as a kind of 'Appendix Eustratiadea', to be provided with similar call-numbers.

II

Operating with the call-numbers I have analyzed the make-up of all Akolouthiai in the Plagios Protos section of seven Heirmologia. Three of these MSS belong to a stable group of Heirmologia from the 12th and 13th centuries, the other four are what we have got of archaic sources for this mode. TABLES I-III show the composition of three of these Akolouthiai; similar diagrams have been made of all Plagios Protos Akolouthiai. Provided with an index the diagrams will enable us to follow the 'iter' of some 390 Heirmoi occurring in one or several of 43 Akolouthiai.

The seven MSS of which the sigla are given in the left hand margin of each diagram are the following: S (Saba 83), L (Lavra B 32), P (Patmos 55), and E (Esphigmenou 54). These are the four sources which use an archaic musical notation. After them follow three members of a manuscript-family which was constituted in the period of Coislin notation - i.e. after the middle of the 11th century - and which was still being copied near the end of the 13th century. The numbers in the left hand margin indicate the position of the Akolouthiai in each MS. The letter "c" which the second diagram adds to some call-numbers is short for 'cue'; these Heirmoi are only represented by their incipits, normally with a reference to an earlier occurrence in the same MS.

The diagram of Eustratiades 185 shows an Akolouthia which is identically composed in all seven MSS. The next diagram, of Eustratiades 194, depicts an 'unstable' Akolouthia, and that of Eustratiades 196 shows two stable versions of an Akolouthia, one encountered in the archaic MSS, the other in the three MSS of the so-called H-group. Akolouthia 196 is not found in Esphigmenou 54.

As already mentioned, the four archaic Heirmologia contain a total of 43 Akolouthiai in their Plagios Protos sections. With a few exceptions the Akolouthiai in these archaic MSS are more stable than the Akolouthia shown on TABLE II; 14 of them are even identically put together in the sources which include them. TABLE IV shows the entire documentation; the stable Akolouthiai are here marked with an arrow (→). There is no need to go into any details now; for our present purpose the interest of the material which is surveyed on TABLE IV lies mainly in the sameness of the four MSS. We may notice, however, that Heirmoi for the second and the ninth Ode are considerably more itinerant than Heirmoi for the other seven Odes.

TABLE IV: Disagreements between SLPE in Plagios Protos

182 SLPE			E + 1701
183 SLPE			E + 1690
→ 184 SLPE			
→ 185 SLPE			
→ 186 SLPE			
→ 187 SLPE			
188 SLPE	S + 1667	L + 1667	
→ 189 SLPE			
190 SLP	S + 1690		
191 SLPE			E + #12
192 SLPE	S + 1701	L + 1701	
193 SLPE, unstable			
194 SLPE	S + #15	P + 1701	E + 1743
	1739 for 1675		
195 SLPE		P 1731 for 1741	

→ 196 SLP		
197 SLPE	S + #15	
→ 198 SLP		
→ 199 SLP		
200 SLPE		P 1732 for 1792
		E partly lost
→ 201 S P		
202 SLP		P 1811 for 1617
203 SLP	L 1807 for #00	
204 SLPE		P + 1690 and #14
205 SLPE	L - 1746	E + 1819
206 SLPE	L - 1726	
→ 207 SLP		
→ 208 SL		
209 SLP	L - #01	
→ 210 SLP		
211 SL, with considerable differences		
212 SL, with considerable differences		
213 SLP	L + 1889 & 1897	P 1774 for 1896
→ 214 SL		
215 SL	L - #02	
216 SL	L - 1759	
217 SL	S #10 for 1930	
218-223 only in L		
→ I S P		

In this table the call-numbers #00 - #15 represent Heirmoi which are not included in Eustratiades's edition; their numbering is only provisional, a different system being still under consideration. The Heirmoi mentioned in TABLE IV are distributed between the nine Odes as follows:

α: 1889
 β: 1701 1726 1746 1759 #01 #02 #12
 γ:
 δ:
 ε: 1807
 ρ: 1739
 ζ: 1667 1731
 η: 1732 1774 1897 #10
 θ: 1690 1743 1811 1819 #14 #15

III

In the *Annales Musicologiques* from 1955 and ten years later, in his introduction to the *Specimina notationum antiquiorum*, Oliver Strunk has a footnote which may guide our next steps⁵. In his text, Strunk says that "the order of the canons within each mode is roughly chronological", and in the footnote the idea is spelled out more precisely. "Each mode", says the footnote, "consists of an 'old layer', which is followed by a series of additions whose arrangement evidently represents the order in which the added canons came to the compiler's attention". Now, if we are to go beyond this general statement, there are several lines which our investigations might follow. For one thing it would be interesting to know whether the 'old layer' of a particular manuscript is in itself a complex, reflecting as it were 'old layers' and additions in the Vorlage or in even more remote ancestors of this particular compilation. Next, we might ask if there is a kind of common core from which the traditions of the extant *Heirmologia* have developed - or whether each *Heirmologion* is a compilation *sui generis*. Also we would be interested to know from what kind of sources the additional *Akolouthiai* have been taken.

We can find no better starting point for such investigations than Saba 83. For it so happens that it is in this particular *Heirmologion* that we can most clearly observe the guiding principle according to which the *Akolouthiai* of all early *Heirmologia* are arranged within the modal section. In all eight modes of Saba 83 we find that the series of *Akolouthiai* begin with those ascribed to John of Damascus, Cosmas of Maioumas, Andrew of Crete, and Germanos, Patriarch of Constantinople - and invariably in the same order: John - Cosmas - Andrew - Germanos. Comparisons with other early *Heirmologia* show that the same principle is observed in all of them, though realized in different order and, usually, with differences from one mode to

5. Oliver Strunk, *The Notation of the Chartres Fragment* (*Annales Musicologiques* 3, 1955) p. 33; quoted in his *Specimina notationum antiquiorum*, Introduction p. 11 (MMB VII).

another in the same MS. Evidently the 'old layer' of any early Heirmologion begins with Akolouthiai ascribed to these four melodes; their order may differ - but they are all there, in neat blocks of Akolouthiai ascribed to one of them.

TABLE V (see next page) is a Synopsis of the Plagios Protos section as found in the four archaic MSS (S,L,P,E) and in three members of the H-group. Saba 83 (S) begins with 6 Akolouthiai by John, followed by 5 of Andrew's and 3 by Germanos; in this mode there is no Akolouthia ascribed to Cosmas. After Germanos follow Akolouthiai ascribed to other poets - but Akolouthia 25 is again an Andrew piece, and Akolouthiai ascribed to Andrew are found scattered around in the following as well. Evidently we have now passed from an original layer to the *additamenta*. A similar reasoning can be applied again and again in other modes and in other manuscripts. By means of what may be called 'later occurrences of Akolouthiai ascribed to John-Cosmas-Andrew-Germanos' we can divide each mode into three parts:

- a. The beginning which *per definitionem* belongs to the 'old layer'.
- b. The end, consisting of additional Akolouthiai.
- c. An intermediary zone - which may or may not belong to the old layer.⁶

There are, of course, other ways to proceed if we want to distinguish the original layer from the additions. I shall mention three of them:

1. In my introduction to the facsimile edition of Saba 83 I show that there are differences in the musical notation, not only between the original stock and the additions but also between several layers of additions.⁷

2. From the Synopsis it is immediately seen that in the Ivireon Heirmologion (H) Akolouthia 22 must be additional; there are similar additions in some of the other modes of the Ivireon manuscript.

3. The Patmos Heirmologion (P) is especially revealing. For

6. For Saba 83, see the table on pp.44-45 of the *Pars Suppletoria* (*Monumenta Musicae Byzantinae* VIII,1. Hauniae 1968).

7. *Ibid.*, pp. 18-22.

TABLE V: Synopsis of Akolouthiai in Plagios Protos

	S	L	P	E	O	H	G
188 Germanos				1			
189 "				2			
182 John	1	1	1	3	1	1	1
183 "			2	4	2	2	2
184 "	2	2	3	5	3	3	3
185 "	3	3	4	6	4	4	4
186 "	4	4	5	7	5	5	5
187 "	5	5	6	8	6	6	6
183 "	6	6					
188 Germanos			7		7	7	7
189 "		7	8		8	8	8
190 "		8			9	9	9
188 Andrew		9					
191 "	7	10	9	9	10	10	10
192 "	8	11	10	10	11	11	11
193 "		12	11	11	12	12	12
194 "	9	13	12	12	13	13	13
195 "	10	14		13	14	14	14
193 "	11						
188 Germanos	12						
189 "	13						
190 "	14						
196 Sinaitic	15	15			15	15	15
204 "	16	16					
197 George	17	17			16	16	16
198 "	18	18			17	17	17
199 Elias	19	19			18	18	18
200 Stephen	20	20			19	19	19
205 Damianos	21	21					
201 Sikelios	22				20	20	20
202 Theod.St.	23	22			} 21	21	21
203 "	24	23					
206 Andrew				14			
205 Damianos			13				

	S	L	P	E	O	H	G
197 George			14	15			
198 "			15	lacuna			
200 Stephen			16	16			
203 Theod.St.			17				
213 Andrew			18				
196 Anatolian			19				
204 Sinaitic			20	17		22	
206 Andrew	25	24					
I "	26						
207 "	27	25					
208 Elias	28	26					
209 Andr.Typh.	29	27					
210 George	30	28					
211 " }	31	29					
212 " }		30					
213 Andrew	32	31					
214 Anatolian	33	32					
215 Sinaitic	35	33					
216 "	36	34					
217 Anatolian	37	35					
190 George			21				
195 Andrew			22				
199 Elias			23 ("19")				
194 Andrew			24 ("13", additions)				
199 Elias			25 ("19", additions)				
201 Sikelios			26				
202 Theod.St.			27				
206 Andrew			28				
I "			29				
207 "			30				
209 Andr.Typhl.			31				
210 George			32				
218 Anatolian	36						
219 Basil Akoimeten	37						
220 Anatolian	38						
221 Cyprianos	39						
222 Anatolian	40						
223 Theognostos Igum.	41						

in this manuscript two different hands have inserted additional Akolouthiai at the end of each mode - and also in the part of P which is written by the main scribe, details reveal that the original product of the main scribe was copied from a Heirmologion which in itself consisted of an old layer and various layers of additions. I have indicated one of these details in the Synopsis (TABLE V, p.45): after its Akolouthia 15 there is in P an ornamental band, but the main scribe has also written the next Akolouthiai.

IV

We are now ready to conclude this preliminary analysis of the contents of some early Heirmologia. The conclusions refer, primarily, to the Plagios Protos section as known from SLPE and their ancestors. It is my impression, however, that similar conclusions may be drawn from the entire Heirmologion in its early shapes:

1. The original core comprised Akolouthiai ascribed to John-Cosmas-Andrew-Germanos and may-be some others - but it excluded, for instance, Theodore Stoudita. We can get an idea of this Old Heirmologion from the first 12 or 13 Akolouthiai of P and E. Since in some modes of P and some modes of E the Akolouthiai by Germanos come first, against the normal practice of giving this honorable place to John of Damascus, we might perhaps see in the frontal placing of Germanos a reflection of the arrangement of the 'Ur-Heirmologion'.

2. This old repertory of Heirmoi has grown and has changed in four different ways, all of which can be seen in the material presented on TABLES IV and V, where we find

- a. regrouping of the original stock of Akolouthiai - for instance in Saba 83 where the same order of the four melodes has been introduced in all eight modes,
- b. addition of whole Akolouthiai,
- c. addition of single Heirmoi; minor changes in the make-up of the single Akolouthiai (for examples, see TABLE IV),
- d. the reverse of (b) and (c): dropping of obsolete Akolouthiai or of single Heirmoi.

3. We ought to distinguish between several types of additions. I shall exemplify some of them:

a. The additions in P seem to correspond exactly to Strunk's general statement, that "their arrangement evidently represents the order in which the added canons came to the compiler's attention".

NB. The wrong ordinal numbers given by P in some of its headings show that the source for this addition was another Heirmologion, and not some office-book. Both Akolouthiai are so numbered in L, Lavra B 32.

b. In S, L, and the H-group a whole block of Akolouthiai have been added to the original core. This block of additions seems to bear a more official stamp than the haphazard additions in P and E. Is it a pure coincidence that this 'Appendix' ends with two Akolouthiai ascribed to St. Theodore Stoudita?

c. Finally, I suppose a local Constantinopolitan tradition for what we find at the end of the Plagios Protos in the Lavra Heirmologion. For among its Akolouthiai 36-41 we find one ascribed to Βασίλειος μοναχός μονῆς τῶν Ἀκουμήτων, and the last Akolouthia is ascribed to one Theognostos Igoumenos. This is an Akolouthia for an iambic Kanon, to be used at the Ascension Feast. Now, as we know from Constantine's Book of Ceremonies, the Emperor used to attend the Ascension service of the Πηγὴ monastery in Constantinople - and from A.D. 868 the Igoumenos of this monastery happened to be Theognostos who got this promotion as a reward for his services towards Ignatios the Patriarch. The headline for the last Plagios Protos Akolouthia thus points strongly towards Constantinople and the famous Πηγὴ monastery as the likely place of origin for these last additions in Lavra B 32.

Postscript: Richard v. Busch's "Untersuchungen zum byzantinischen Heirmologion. Der Echos Deuteros", Verlag der Musikalienhandlung Karl Dieter Wagner, Hamburg 1971 (= Hamburger Beiträge zur Musikwissenschaft hrsg. v. Georg v. Dadelsen. Band 4) was apparently written before the first volumes of the facsimiles of Saba 83 were published. Evidently, the detailed and careful work put forward in this important monography will be an extremely useful check on the results of my own small-scale investigations.